

DAU RESEARCH PAPER EVALUATION RUBRIC

DAU RESEARCH PAPER AWARD EVALUATION RUBRIC

Author: Michael Kotzian, Dec. 2010

Article Number:

Manuscript Title:

Reviewer Name:

Reviewer Phone:

Reviewer Email:

Review Round:

Criteria	Weight	Evaluation Criteria			Score	Weighted Score
		Excellent (100-90)	Good (89-80)	Poor (Below 80)		
Purpose / Significance	40%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Author's purpose or argument is clearly apparent to the reader. • Author clearly supports a central purpose or argument associated with defense acquisition. • Author's hypothesis is creative and breaks "new ground." • Reader gains important insights. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Author's purpose or argument is generally clear, but it may sometimes digress from its central theme. • Author somewhat supports a central purpose or argument associated with defense acquisition. • Author's hypothesis is interesting, but somewhat dependent upon "old ground." • Reader gains some insights. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Author's purpose or argument is not consistently clear throughout the paper. • Author does not clearly support a central purpose or argument associated with defense acquisition. • Author's hypothesis is not original and mostly discusses "old ground." • Reader gains few, if any, insights. 		0
Organization	20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Article's ideas are arranged logically to support the author's purpose or argument. • Ideas flow smoothly from one to another, and are clearly linked. • Reader can easily follow the author's line of reasoning/rationale. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Article's ideas are sometimes arranged logically to support the author's central purpose or argument. • Ideas are sometimes not clearly linked to each other. • For the most part, the reader can follow the author's line of reasoning/rationale. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Article's ideas are not arranged logically to support the author's central purpose or argument. • Ideas frequently fail to make sense together. • Reader has some difficulties following the author's line of reasoning/rationale. 		0

DAU RESEARCH PAPER EVALUATION RUBRIC

Criteria	Weight	Evaluation Criteria			Score	Weighted Score
		Excellent (100-90)	Good (89-80)	Poor (Below 80)		
Research	15%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research design is appropriate to the problem being addressed. Selection of the research population/sample is adequate given nature of the research. Analysis, interpretations, and conclusions are reasonable given the research findings. Results are credible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research design is somewhat appropriate to the problem being addressed. Selection of the research population/sample is somewhat adequate given the nature of the research. Analysis, interpretations, and conclusions are marginally reasonable given the research findings. Results are only somewhat 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research design is not appropriate to the problem being addressed. Selection of the research population/sample is not adequate given the nature of the research. Analysis, interpretations, and conclusions are not reasonable given the research findings. Results are not credible. 		0
References	10%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All references provide compelling evidence to support the author's arguments. Vast majority of references are scholarly and peer-reviewed. Majority of references are correctly cited IAW APA guidelines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some references provide compelling evidence to support the author's arguments, but a few arguments are unsubstantiated. Some references are scholarly and peer-reviewed, with few of marginal quality. Some references are correctly cited IAW APA guidelines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Few references provide compelling evidence to support the author's arguments, but some arguments are unsubstantiated. References are mix of some scholarly and peer-reviewed, but many are of marginal quality. Only some references are correctly cited IAW APA guidelines. 		0
Readability	10%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The writing is compelling. The writing hooks the reader and sustains interest throughout the article. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The writing is generally engaging, but has some dull spots. The writing is focused and generally keeps the reader's attention. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The writing is generally dull and unengaging. Though the paper has some interesting parts, the reader finds it difficult to maintain interest. 		0

DAU RESEARCH PAPER EVALUATION RUBRIC

Grammar	5%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The writing has virtually no writing errors, and helps communicate the author's intended message. • The reader can easily follow the writing with virtually no effort. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The writing has occasional writing errors, but they do not represent a major distraction or obscure the author's intended message. • The reader can mostly follow the writing with minimal effort. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The writing has many errors and they represent a distraction to the author's message. • The reader can only follow the writing with a lot of effort. 		0
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE:						0

REVIEWER EVALUATION

Recommendation:

☐

Accept

☐

Accept with Minor Revision

☐

Reconsider After Major Revision

☐

Reject

Priority:

Publish Immediately

☐

Give High Priority

☐

No Rush

☐

REVIEWER REMARKS TO ARJ EDITOR

DAU RESEARCH PAPER EVALUATION RUBRIC

--

Reviewer's Signature: _____